

Application no.: 09/592,163
Amdt date: April 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

REMARKS / ARGUMENT

A. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-24 are pending. In the office action having a mailing date of January 30, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-24 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,158,010 to Moriconi et al. (hereinafter "*Moriconi*") in view of US Patent No. 5,987,508 to Agraharam et al. (hereinafter "*Agraharam*") and US Patent No. 5,991,771 to Falls et al. (hereinafter "*Falls*").

B. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

The present application discloses by example the management and system for management of edge devices by a policy server whereby the a user need only monitor and take action via the policy server interface to effect changes to the policy settings at the constituent edge devices. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the system being configured to update the first and second edge devices with user-initiated policy settings updating. Likewise, independent claim 13 has been amended to include the method of updating the first and second edge devices with user initiated updates to policy settings.

The presently claimed invention has first and second edge devices having policy settings effected by a policy server. Edge devices are known in the art to comprise a physical device that for example passes packets between a network such as an Ethernet network, and an asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) network, using Data Link layer and Network layer information. The Applicant respectfully submits that it is know in the art that an edge device does not typically have responsibility for gathering network routing information, but typically uses the routing information of the network layer using the route distribution protocol. The Applicant also respectfully submits It is also known in the art that an edge router is an example of an edge device and is sometimes referred to as

A

Application no.: 09/592,165
Amdt date: April 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

a boundary router. For example, an edge router routes data packets between one or more local area networks (LANs) and an ATM backbone network (e.g., a campus network or a wide area network). The Applicant respectfully submits that while edge devices, by their nature, retransmit information, it is known in the art that an edge router may be contrasted with a core router, which forwards packets to computer hosts within a network, but not between networks as an edge router typically does.

Moriconi discloses a central policy server where the system comprises a policy manager located on a server for managing and distributing a local client policy based on a global security policy, and an application guard located on a client, or located on a server associated with one or more clients, for managing access to securable components as specified by the local client policy. The client of *Moriconi* is an end device or node, that is a physical end point of transmissions within a network to the client and the local policies apply to the resources of the end device. The Applicant respectfully submits that *Moriconi* neither discloses the distributed policy settings and updating of the policy settings of the edge devices as claimed in the present application. Moreover, the Applicant respectfully submits that the application of edge devices are neither suggested nor disclosed in the cited art.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed distributed command and control of the policy settings of the edge devices are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art edge devices. The application respectfully submits the claimed invention is unobvious in light of the cited art because, in part, the edge devices of the presently claimed invention are patently distinguishable from end nodes, particularly in the function of their policies and the target (i.e., other nodes for edge devices versus devices within the node for the clients of *Moriconi*) over which they enforce the distributed policies.

The Applicant respectfully submits that it follows from the above remarks that the amended independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited art and that the respective dependent claims, i.e., claims 2 - 12 and 14 - 24, merely add further

A

Application no.: 09/592,165
Amdt date: April 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2004

clarification or limitation and are therefore distinguishable. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner remove the rejection to claims 1 - 24.

C. CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Should there be any fees for this action, your office is authorized to draw from the firm deposit account number 02-3979. Should you have any questions, or identify any problem, the undersigned would appreciate a telephone call so that this matter may be resolved promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Blaine Brooks, PC

By: 

Michael Blaine Brooks
Reg. No. 39,921
5010 No. Parkway Calabasas
Suite 104
Calabasas, CA 91302
Tel.: (818) 225-2920 ext. 203

A